



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/366,064	08/02/1999	JASON ROBERT MALAURE	GIL4-BH60	2626
21611	7590	12/05/2005	EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER LLP 600 ANTON BOULEVARD SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA, CA 92626			HUYNH, SON P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/366,064	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MALAURE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Son P. Huynh	<b>Art Unit</b> 2611	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 05 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues McNeill does not disclose, "different broadcast networks" and "different broadcast protocol" as claimed. Instead, McNeill disclose a single network and single broadcast protocol (page 3, lines 4-17).

In response, this argument is respectfully traversed. Claims 1 and 9 merely recite, "different broadcast network, each broadcast network operating a respectively different broadcast protocol," (claim 1 or claim 9, lines 2-3). McNeill discloses transmitting conference data with interactive application (i.e. application for chat) in existing networks (col. 3, lines 20-23). McNeill further discloses the conference presentation communicates with multiple remote computing system 112-115 (figure 1). Delivering web pages in different protocol appropriate to the varying remote computer systems used by the remote conference participants (col. 4, lines 9-13). Thus, the claimed feature of "different broadcast networks" is broadly met by different broadcast networks connect to different remote computing system (each broadcast network connects to one computing system); and the claimed feature of "each broadcast network operating a respectively different broadcast protocol" is broadly met by each broadcast network (network connect to a remote computing system) operating an appropriate protocol used by the remote conference participant.

In the alternative rejection, applicant argues Agraharam teaches away from a combination because the transcoding procedure of Agraharam results in the conversion of the HTML information to a non-interactive format. Then, the applicant concludes the combination of Agraharam and Travaille is improper because such a combination would destroy the interactive feature disclosed by Travaille (page 4, paragraphs 2-5).

In response, this argument is respectfully traversed. Claims 1 and 9 recite, "converting the set of application components into a plurality of streams of broadcast data". The claims do not recite converting the components into interactive or non-interactive format. In addition, nowhere in the Agraharam discloses conversion of the HTML information to a non-interactive format, instead, Agraharam discloses the client terminal, which can directly act on HTML (col. 3, lines 12-14). Thus, the HTML received at the client terminal is in interactive format. Furthermore, the claimed feature of "interactive application" is already disclosed in Travaille (interactive application 115), the examiner relies on Agraharam for the teaching of each broadcast network operating at respectively different broadcast protocols (HTML, MPEG-2). Therefore, the combination is proper.

For the reason given above, rejections on claims 1-9, 11-22 are analyzed as discussed in the Final Office Action. .



**CHRISTOPHER GRANT**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**